

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 7, 2006.

As noted below, this paper should be considered as a Petition for Extension of Time if one is deemed necessary. Claims 6-17, 20-22 and 26-41 are pending in this application, with claims 6 and 20 being in independent form. It is submitted that no new matter has been added and no new issues have been raised by the present Amendment.

Claims 6-8, 13-17, 20, 22, 33, 34, 37, 39 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0233287 to Bulatov et al. Claims 21, 26-32, 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bulatov et al. Claims 9-12 and 38 were rejected under Section 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bulatov in view of U.S. Patent 5,892, 503 to Kim. Claim 41 was rejected under Section 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bulatov et al. in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0187925.

Applicants have carefully considered the Examiner's comments and the cited art, and respectfully submit independent claims 6 and 20 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

The primary reference cited in the Office Action is Bulatov et al. Applicants point out that Bulatov et al. was originally filed as a provisional application on April 14, 2004. In contrast, the present application was filed in the United States on May 15, 2001 and is based on an Israeli application dated May 14, 2001. Accordingly, Bulatov et al. is not prior art to the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney discussed this case with Examiner Nguyen on July 26, 2006 and pointed out that Bulatov et al. is not prior art. The Examiner requested that Applicants

file a short response to this effect and that he would likely allow the case in response thereto.

Since Bulatov et al. is the primary reference used in each of the rejections and since Bulatov et al. is not prior art to the present case, it is believed that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

Since the application should not have been rejected based on the Bulatov et al. reference, it is believed that the present Office Action was issued in error. Applicants' undersigned attorney tried but was unable to contact the Examiner to discuss this case on numerous occasions prior to July 26, 2006. Accordingly, it is believed that Applicants should not have to bear the cost of any fees required for reconsideration of the present application.

However, if it is deemed that a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite SMALL ENTITY fees to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125. The applicant of the present application is a SMALL ENTITY.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Entry of this amendment and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



RICHARD F. JAWORSKI
Reg. No. 33,515
Attorney for Applicants
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400